

this Congress must continue funding and strengthening science and mathematics education. Supporting this bill is an important step, and I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I know my good friend from Texas did not intend to, but I would respectfully request the Chair make certain that he calls into order individuals who impugn the motive of other Members of this body. I think it is important that we not do that in this Chamber.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Let me be the first, because I believe we are all distinguished gentlemen, gentleladies and gentlemen, say that my remarks were to the value of this bill and to my philosophical disagreement with the author of this amendment, and certainly recognize that he is proud of America and all of the inventiveness that she has, and therefore any intent that might have been perceived by my words were only to glorify this bill and to celebrate our researchers and our science in this country.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentlelady's comments, and I would just respectfully suggest it might be appropriate to review the words that were spoken and reflect upon them.

Mr. Chairman, I would also suggest candidly that my recollection, I am not absolutely certain, but my recollection is that the Wright Brothers and Thomas Edison had no government subsidy, and the remarkable inventions that they came up with were without the benefit of government subsidy. That is not to say that government subsidy isn't appropriate for certain occasions, but I would suggest that those individuals had remarkable accomplishments without the kind of support that we are discussing today.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield to my good friend from New Jersey, the sponsor of the amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the other side of the aisle has mischaracterized what this amendment does when they speak of cuts and pullbacks from science and the Foundation. Nothing of the kind is in this amendment. Instead, we will still be increasing spending this year and next year and next year and next year up to \$20.87 billion for these appropriated expenditures on the National Science Foundation, instead of \$20.97 billion.

I am very much concerned about education and science and our research. Let me just add, I am also concerned about the education of our youth. My constituents are just as concerned

about educating their kids and being able to afford to send their kids to college and how do they pay for that? My constituents are concerned about the health care and the medical expenditures for their families and how do they pay for that? My constituents are concerned about the housing for their family and loved ones, and how do they pay for that?

They are not seeing a 7 percent increase in their wages and salaries, even though each and every one of those things are just as vitally important to them as it is that we spend money on overall Science Foundation research in the United States of America.

□ 2115

This amendment would not cut spending by a dime. This amendment would simply limit the growth rate from 7 percent down to 6.5 percent. The last amendment was seeing it go down from 7 percent to 6 percent. This would be even less, from 7 to 6.5 percent. You would still be seeing a growth year after year after year. The NSF would still be allowed to expend their dollars on those critical areas that my friend from Georgia and the Members on the other side of the aisle are so concerned about for the betterment of this country.

I would implore the Members on the other side of the aisle that if we are to be consistent when we talk about the overall spending and revenue side for this Congress, that we stop doing what the other side of the aisle has done. They have only looked at the revenue side of the equation so far in the last 3 or 4 months, giving us the largest tax increase in America's history on the other hand, but have done absolutely nothing for the American public when it says how are we going to set priorities for the American public and what we spend money on, and how are we going to try to rein in spending for the American public as well. I think we need to do it on both sides.

Finally, regarding what the gentleman from Michigan said, I agree with him. If we can do it across the board for all of the other programs, I am right in line with him, and I support him on that endeavor as well. Let's start here, and I will be the first one to cosponsor any of his amendments to do likewise, decreasing the overall increases of spending that this government has.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Just briefly, I want to comment on a comment made by my friend from New Jersey about health care, a very, very important issue. But the only way we are going to be able to offer better health care to everyone is by reducing the cost.

One huge element of cost in health care is cancer treatment. Today at lunch I met with the latest seven Nobel

Prize winners all of whom happen to be from America because we support this research.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Mr. EHLERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Just to continue, today the Science Committee had lunch with the latest Nobel Prize winners, all of whom are from America because we try very hard to provide funding for the research. They, I might point out, did the research a number of years ago. I hope we can continue to provide Nobel Prize winners by adequately funding the National Science Foundation and others.

But in speaking to the gentleman who got the award in physiology and medicine, he talked about his discovery and the impact it is going to have on cancer treatment. That is very likely to cause a substantial reduction in the cost of the treatment of cancer using his approach.

What does his approach depend on? That is the Human Genome Project which we started a number of years ago in NIH and were the first Nation to do that.

It is always amazing to me how discoveries that we find in one area can have application, and no one, I think, dreamed that when we did the Human Genome Project that we might find the cure of cancer there rather than in medicine. So it is very important that we continue funding the fundamental basic research so we can continue to enjoy the fruits of their research.

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I thank Mr. EHLERS for his comments.

Very briefly, in 2002, 397 Members of this Congress, including 194 Members of the then-majority party Republicans, voted to double, double, the National Science Foundation.

For those members of your party who plan to vote against this bill or who plan to vote for this reduction in the authorized levels for this committee, I would just suggest you well may be voting against something that you voted for just a few years ago at much higher levels and that the President signed into law. The then-majority voted to double the budget. The President signed it into law at much higher levels than what we are talking about today.

In the last Presidential election, somebody ran around with a flip-flop guy chasing Mr. KERRY. If you do this, the flip-flop guy might be outside your door.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.